

very often. As I say, in the private sector, people are forced to change from time to time in order to continue to be effective and to continue to modernize. I do not think it is reasonable to think that a program that started in the 1950s, and it is now 2003, that that program is being done as efficiently as it might be. I frankly sometimes think it would be a good idea if the various things we pass that go into some kind of services, some kind of activity, should expire and we should have to go through the process of reexamining what that operation is doing and if it is still needed—and it may or may not be—then see if it is being done in the most efficient way possible.

There are operations in the Government, of course, that are designed to do that, such as OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, but it is very difficult.

I am pleased that President Bush has a modernization program going, but there is all kinds of resistance. The resistance can be political: If it does not happen to suit one's particular community as a politician, why, they are opposed to that. I think it is fair to say clearly that the labor union leaders who are involved with Government unions are overreacting to the idea that some things ought to be made available to be done in the private sector, which I think is a very reasonable thing to do.

We now have sort of an overstatement of things that are trying to be done in the National Park Service. Well, there should be a few things that are competitive with the private sector, but the whole Park Service is not going to be turned over to the private sector. No one has suggested that, but that is the kind of thing we get.

I do think we ought to pay a little more attention to how we could make the delivery of services more efficient and how we could review the services that are being delivered to see if indeed they are in keeping with the times. That has to be done in a special way because it just does not happen automatically. Politics keeps it from happening. Sometimes labor unions are resistant to any change. I think it is our responsibility, and I intend to continue to look for opportunities, to examine, evaluate, and try to move forward in making the delivery of essential services more efficient whenever possible.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I understand we are to resume debate on S. 14 at 10?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CRAIG. The chairman of the committee who is managing the bill is not yet on the floor. Until he comes, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for no more than 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the bill should be reported and then go into morning business.

Mr. CRAIG. I am going to talk on energy, anyway, so we could do that. I would withdraw my UC.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 14, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 14) to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Feinstein amendment No. 876, to tighten oversight of energy markets.

Reid amendment No. 877 (to amendment No. 876), to exclude metals from regulatory oversight by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from the great State of Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, we are now resuming debate on S. 14, the national energy policy for our country. I have been on the floor several times over the last number of weeks as we have debated different amendments. Yesterday, there were a couple of critical votes as it related to nuclear. We have a derivatives amendment at this time by the Senator from California, and I think the Senator from Nevada has a second degree on it.

A fundamental question again emerges, and emerged yesterday at a hearing on the Hill, with the statement of our Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan as to the importance of a national energy policy.

Why is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, who is interested in the prime rate and the management of monetary supply of our country, concerned about energy? It is fundamental why he is concerned about energy. He is concerned about the economy of our country and its strength, stability, and ability to grow and provide jobs for the men and women who currently do not have them, and to strengthen and stabilize those jobs for the men and women who currently do have jobs.

What was he talking about yesterday? He was talking about one of the primary feed stocks for energy in our country, natural gas; the problems that we currently have with the supply of natural gas because this country has not effectively explored and developed, for a variety of reasons, our natural gas supply.

In the context of not providing supply, we have provided extraordinary de-

mands on the current supply. Under the Clean Air Act, to meet those clean air standards, and out in the Western States and those air sheds specifically, the only way you can meet those standards and bring a new electrical generating plant on line is to choose to use gas to fire a turbine, to generate electricity. That is a tremendously inefficient way to use the valuable commodity of natural gas, but that is exactly what the Federal Government has told our utilities over the last two decades: If you are going to bring a new generation on line, it will be a gas-fired electrical turbine. Coal has problems; we are working on clean coal technology. This legislation embodies trying to get us to a cleaner technology to fire the coal electrical generation in our country.

As a result, what are we talking about? What has been said and what we believe to be true is that there is now rapidly occurring a major shortage in natural gas. As a result, that is not only going to drive up the cost to the consumer in his or her individual home—and I will read from an article: Another witness, Donald Mason, head of the Ohio Public Utilities Commission, predicted that the average residential heating bill next winter will be at least \$220 higher per household than last winter.

That is a real shock to an economy and to a household and why Alan Greenspan is obviously worried that you spread that across a consuming nation, and we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars pulled out of the economy to go to the cost of heating when it had not been the case before. That was one of the concerns.

The other concern is the tremendous price hike we are seeing at this time and the impact that will have. Gas prices have nearly doubled in the past year to about \$6.31 per Btu, and there is a 25-percent change expected. We expect prices to peak and we have seen one instance, about 3 months ago, over a 200-percent increase in the price of natural gas as a spike in the market.

S. 14 is legislation to help facilitate the construction of a major delivery system out of Alaska. In Alaska at this moment we are pumping billions of Btu's of gas back into the ground because we simply cannot transport it to the lower 48 States, and we do not want to flare it into the atmosphere as has been the approach in the past in gas-fields. It is too valuable a commodity, and we do not want to do that to the environment.

We have also looked at other opportunities for access. Part of the difficulty today is delivery systems and building gas pipelines across America. This legislation has provisions to help facilitate more of that as it relates to right of way and, of course, the recognition of the environmental need and the consequence and appropriate adjustment there.

What Alan Greenspan underlines in his comments, what Donald Mason